



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,800	01/06/2004	Bryan Severt Hallberg	8371-170	6457

46404 7590 11/20/2007
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. - Sharp
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

ADEGEYE, OLUWASEUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/20/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/753,800	Applicant(s) HALLBERG, BRYAN SEVERT	
	Examiner Oluwaseun A. Adegeye	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/06/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13 - 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01/06/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/26/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 09/10/2007, with respect to claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re pages 5 – 6, applicants argue with respect to claims 1 and 2 that there is nothing in the Vantalon reference that discloses a first storage location coupled to the media encoder and structured to buffer an encoded media stream and a second storage location structured to store encoded data retrieved from the interface.

Vantalon clearly discloses a first storage location (46) coupled to the media encoder (48, ATM encoder) and structured to buffer an encoded media stream (see column 7, lines 10 – 17).

Vantalon also discloses a second storage location (36) structured to store encoded data retrieved from the interface (see column 5, lines 25 – 51). The reference taken as a whole also discloses another storage location (28, removable smart card) structured to store encoded data retrieved from the interface (72, smart card interface) (see column 6, lines 57 – 65 and column 7, lines 28 – 36).

Buffer (46) stores data received from the set-top box (see column 7, lines 12 – 17) which is data from a media stream.

It is clear from the above explanations that Vantalon clearly discloses both storage locations in the claimed concept.

In re pages 8 – 9, applicant argues with respect to claim 7 that there is nothing in the Vantalon reference that discloses a controller coupled to the media encoder and to the storage location, the controller structured to accept a command from the media encoder after the encoded media stream is stored in the storage location.

Vantalon clearly discloses a controller (17, conditional access module) coupled to the media encoder (48) and to the storage location (46), the controller structured to accept a command from the media encoder after the encoded media stream is stored in the storage location (see column 5, lines 31 – 51 and column 7, lines 15 – 20).

Vantalon clearly discloses a controller that teaches the claimed concept.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vantalon et al (US 7,216,358 B1).

As to **claim 1**, Vantalon discloses a television system (see column 3, lines 66 – 67), comprising:

a media encoder (48) having an input for accepting an incoming video media stream (see column 7, lines 10 – 16);

a first storage location (46) coupled to the media encoder and structured to buffer an encoded media stream (see column 7, lines 16 – 17) ;

a processor (42) structured to generate signals to copy portions of the buffered media stream to an interface for removable media (28) (see column 7, lines 33 – 35) ;

a second storage location (36) structured to store encoded data retrieved from the interface (see column 5, lines 19 – 30 and column 7, lines 24 – 27); and

a decoder (33) coupled to the second storage location and structured to deliver an outgoing video stream (see column 5, lines 19 – 23).

As to **claim 2**, Vantalon discloses the television system of claim 1 wherein the interface comprises a slot structured to hold a PCMCIA card (see column 6, lines 57 – 59 and column 7, lines 35 – 36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3, 4, 5 – 6 and 9 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Hong et al (US 2002/0039245 A1).

As to **claim 3**, Vantalon discloses the television system of claim 1 but does not disclose wherein the interface is structured to hold more than one removable media simultaneously.

Hong discloses wherein the interface is structured to hold more than one removable media simultaneously (see [36] and [40]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an interface structured to hold more than one removable media simultaneously taught by Hong to the apparatus of Vantalon to expand the storage capacity of the device (see [003]).

As to **claim 4**, Hong discloses the television system of claim 1 wherein the interface comprises a set of pins structured to connect to a removable media item to the processor (laptop) (see [35] and [36]).

As to **claim 5**, Hong discloses the television system of claim 3 wherein the interface comprises:

a first set of pins (222a) structured to connect a first piece of removable media to the processor (see [36]); and

a second set of pins (222b) structured to connect a second piece of removable media to the processor (see [36]).

As to **claim 6**, Hong discloses the television system of claim 5 wherein at least one of the pins from the first set connects to a same input of the processor as at least one of the pins from the second set (see [36]).

Grounds for rejecting claims 3 - 6 apply for **claims 9 - 12** respectively in its entirety.

8. Claims 7 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Bezzant et al (US 6,014,717) and Sheu et al (US 2004/0244054 A1).

As to **claim 7**, Vantalon discloses a television (TV) (13) [an audio/video system] (see column 5, lines 35 – 38), comprising:

a media encoder (48) having an input for accepting a media stream (see column 7, lines 10 – 16), and having a control input (17) for accepting a command to encode the media stream (see column 7, lines 17 – 20);

a storage location (46) coupled to the media encoder and structured to buffer an encoded media stream(see column 7, lines 16 – 17);

a controller (17) coupled to the media encoder and to the storage location, the controller structured to accept a command from the media encoder after the encoded media stream is stored in the storage location (see column 5, lines 38 – 51 and column 7, lines 17 - 20);

a processor (42) structured to generate signals to copy portions of the buffered media stream to the interface when removable media (28) is coupled to the interface (see column 7, lines 33 – 35).

an interface (72) for connecting said removable media (28) to said controller (42)
(see column 6, lines 57 – 65, fig. 4, fig. 5 and column 5, lines 31 – 51).

Vantalon does not disclose a detector structured to detect presence of removable media coupled to an interface of the controller and a slot in said TV for holding at least one removable recording media.

Bezzant discloses a detector (108) structured to detect presence of removable media coupled to an interface of the controller (see column 5, lines 2 – 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added a detector taught by Bezzant to the device of Vantalon to improve the speed and efficiency of the system (see column 1, lines 25 – 30).

Vantalon in view of Bezzant does not disclose a slot in said TV for holding at least one removable recording media.

Sheu discloses a slot (14, memory card slot) in said TV for holding at least one removable recording media (see [008] and [015]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added a slot in said TV for holding at least one removable recording media as taught by Sheu to the apparatus of Vantalon in view of Bezzant to reduce the number of entangled electric wires, reduce space and to provide a television

having a high added value so that users need not to additionally purchase a card reader or an optical disc player, hence accomplishing the advantage of a lower cost (see [003] and [007]).

As to **claim 8**, Vantalon discloses the system of claim 7 wherein the interface (70) (see column 6, line 59) comprises a slot structured to hold a PCMCIA card (see column 7, lines 35 – 36).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,016,402 discloses removable disk drives.

10. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oluwaseun A. Adegeye whose telephone number is 571-270-1711. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

11/14/2007

O.A

Marsha D. Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600